

REMARKS

Claims 1, 16, 31, 43, 58, 63, 68, and 73 have been amended to make explicit what was previously implicit. These amendments are supported in the specification on page 5, lines 6-9 and page 11, lines 9-18, among others.

The 35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejection

According to M.P.E.P. § 2131, "[a] claim is anticipated [under 35 U.S.C. §102(a), (b), and (e)] only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." It goes on to state that "[t]he elements must be arranged as required by the claim..."

Claims 1-77 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being allegedly anticipated by *Naganuma et al.* (US 5,917,729). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Each and every element as set forth in the present claims are not found in *Naganuma*. Furthermore, the various combinations of elements proposed by the Office Action are never arranged by *Naganuma* in the same manner as proposed by the Office Action or as required by the present claims.

Generally, the Office Action states that *Naganuma* discloses or suggests all of the claim limitations. However, the claims as amended emphasize that the focus is a "microprocessor design having a grid-based clock distribution net". As noted in the specification in paragraphs 0006 and 0007, the grid-based design is as opposed to a tree-based design with the former presenting unique design considerations over the latter. *Naganuma* only discloses a tree-based design. (See FIGS. 2, 16, and 29, column 11, lines 51-53, and column 12, lines 6-10 and 21-23 (ST14), among others.) Further, citations to FIG. 1 are misplaced as it is presented by *Naganuma* as prior art, is criticized by *Naganuma* on column 1, lines 30-47, and is thus not part of the disclosed invention of *Naganuma*. Consequently, *Naganuma* can not be said to anticipate the presently claimed invention.

In view of the above, it is respectfully asserted that the claims are now in condition for allowance.

Request for Allowance

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and an early allowance of this application are earnestly solicited.

If any matters remain which could be resolved in a telephone interview between the Examiner and the undersigned, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned to expedite resolution of any such matters.

Respectfully submitted,
THELEN, REID, & PRIEST LLP

Dated: April 7, 2003



David B. Ritchie
Reg. No. 31,562

Thelen, Reid, & Priest LLP
P.O. Box 640640
San Jose, CA 95164-0640
(408) 292-5800